AF2618
ZW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant:	Ylian Saint-Hilaire, et al.	Art Unit:	2618
Serial No.:	09/826,251	Examiner:	Lewis G. West
Filed:	April 4, 2001	Atty Docket:	ITL.0554US P11113
For:	Extending Personal Area Networks	Assignee:	Intel Corporation

Mail Stop **Appeal Brief-Patents**
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF

In response to the new position taken by the Examiner in the Examiner's Answer, the following reply brief is propounded.

Specifically, it is noted that in the final rejection, the rejection of claim 1 was premised on paragraphs 28, 35, 36, and 42. See final rejection at page 3. Now, in the "response to argument" on page 8 of the Answer, the Examiner contends that paragraph 56 of the cited Walley reference supports the rejection.

To the contrary, paragraph 56 expressly teaches away from the claimed invention. Specifically, the Examiner's arguments on page 8 seem to suggest that if the Examiner can find two networks that communicate with one another, he has what is claimed. To the contrary, the claim is explicit that the address information about devices in the first radio frequency network

Date of Deposit: December 13, 2006
I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as **first class mail** with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Cynthia L. Hayden

Cynthia L. Hayden

must be communicated "over a non-radio frequency network to a second radio frequency network."

Paragraph 56 explains that the two networks pointed out by the Examiner may communicate, but that this requires that "a device from one of the two networks must be initialized into the other network through one of the methods discussed." The only methods discussed appear to be simply bringing one device close enough to the other network to enable it to be initialized in both networks. See paragraphs 54 and 55.

Nothing in this reference ever suggests enabling a device in one network to be initialized into another network by communicating address information about devices in the first network over a non-radio frequency network to the second network. The communication suggested in Figure 10 by dotted line 1012, is a radio frequency connection. See paragraph 55. Thus, the cited reference explicitly teaches away from the claimed invention and for this further reason, reversal would be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 13, 2006

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 S. Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation